



NatureScot
NàdarAlba

Scotland's Nature Agency
Buidheann Nàdair na h-Alba

Accompanying reports
Findings from the surveys
The Summary
Consultation - paper
Report number 2(d)
May 2025

A report on the proposal for a national park in southwest Scotland

Introduction

This report sets out findings from the analysis of responses to the Summary Consultation survey (paper leaflet version) received during the public consultation on Scottish Government's proposal for a new national park in the southwest of Scotland. Separate reports provide the findings from the other survey formats: the Technical Consultation, Summary Consultation (online) and freehand responses. They are part of the set of 21 reports that accompany the advice provided by NatureScot as Reporter, submitted to Scottish Government on 5 May 2025.

Percentages presented throughout have been rounded to the nearest single decimal place and may therefore not add up to one hundred. Quotes have been selected with the aim of presenting a range of views and topics.

Summary

The paper version of the Summary survey was included on the approximately 50,000 leaflets sent to household and business addresses in the proposal area. We received 341 paper responses to this survey. It can be expected that some proportion of the recipients of the leaflet will have used the link provided and submitted an online response.

As with the other surveys, opinions were polarised, particularly around reasons for supporting or opposing the proposal. Responses to the paper survey were also shorter than to the other two surveys, likely reflecting the constraints of the format. As such, some responses were brief, with many participants choosing to skip or only briefly answer later questions.

Contents

A report on the proposal for a national park in southwest Scotland

2	Introduction
2	Summary
3	Contents
4	Response profile
4	Breakdown of responses by identity questions and the capacity of response.
4	Open question response rate
5	Location of paper survey participants
5	Consultation response publication preference
<hr/>	
6	Survey Findings
6	Support for the proposal
6	Q1a To what extent do you support the idea of a new National Park being established in the south west of Scotland?
6	Q1b Please tell us the main reasons(s) for your opinion
8	Possible options for the National Park area
8	Q2a Which option do you prefer?
8	Q2b Would you like to make any changes to or comments on your preferred option (e.g. make it smaller or larger, add or remove particular areas, features or settlements)? If so, where and why?
10	Planning, functions and powers
10	Q3 Please note any comments on these suggestions for planning, access, forestry and wind farms in the box below.
12	Board composition
12	Q4a Do you support these suggestions for Board size and percentage of directly elected members
12	Q4b What alternative options do you suggest?
13	Q4c Please explain why
14	Board expertise
14	Q5a Should Scottish Ministers appointments to the Board include expertise on nature, farming and forestry?
14	Q5b What other areas of expertise would the Board require, and why?
16	Name of the national park
16	Q6a Do you agree the park, if established, should be called the Kingdom of Galloway National Park?
16	Q6b If not, what alternatives would you suggest?
17	Q12 Please add here any other comments that are relevant to the proposal.

Response profile

The paper summary survey received a total of 341 responses, of which 32 provided no contact information and 1 was deemed to be an invalid duplicate. Accordingly, 308 responses were included in the quantitative analysis.

Breakdown of responses by identity questions and the capacity of response.

Table 1 - breakdown of responses by relationship to the proposed area

Relationship	Business	Household	Individual	Organisation	Blank	Total
Live in proposal area	20	100	197	-	2	319
Work in proposal area	19	40	67	-	1	127
Farmer or forester, or work in these sectors	12	13	29	-	-	54
Landowner / land manager	14	18	37	-	-	69
Local councillor or other elected representative	-	2	4	-	-	6
Business owner	16	12	29	-	1	58
Retired	1	63	126	-	2	192
Student / in full-time education	-	2	4	-	-	6
Frequent visitor to the area	-	3	5	-	-	8

Open question response rate

Table 2 - free text question response rates

No	Question Description	Average response length	Non responses
Q1b	Please tell us the main reasons for your opinion	26	59
Q2b	Would you like to make any changes to or comments on your preferred option (e.g. make it smaller or larger, add or remove particular areas, features or settlements)? If so, where and why?	13	125
Q3	Please note any comments on these suggestions for planning, access, forestry and wind farms in the box below.	21	152
Q4b	What alternative options do you suggest?	6	160
Q4c	Please explain why	10	154

No	Question Description	Average response length	Non responses
Q5b	What other areas of expertise would the Board require, and why?	16	127
Q6b	If not, what alternatives would you suggest?	7	137
Q12	Please add here any other comments that are relevant to the proposal	29	157

Location of paper survey participants

Table 3 – Breakdown of address details provided by paper survey participants in relation to the Option Areas outlined in the proposal

Location	Total	Support	Oppose	Undecided	Blank
All inside Option Area 1	109	35	70	2	2
All inside Option Area 2	199	68	125	3	3
All inside Option Area 3	257	99	151	3	4
All within 30km of proposal area	279	107	165	3	4
All beyond 30km of proposal area	3	1	2	0	0

Consultation response publication preference

Table 4 – breakdown of permission to publish

Permission	Count	Percentage
Do not publish response	34	10.0%
Publish response only (without name)	218	63.9%
Publish response with name	81	23.8%
Blank	8	2.4%

Survey Findings

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL

Q1a To what extent do you support the idea of a new National Park being established in the south west of Scotland?

Table 5 – breakdown of responses in favour or opposition

Stance	Count	Percentage
Strongly Opposed	181	53.1%
Tend to oppose	24	7.0%
Tend to Support	46	13.5%
Strongly support	80	23.5%
Undecided	4	1.2%
Blank	6	1.8%
Total	341	-

Q1b Please tell us the main reasons(s) for your opinion

Summary

Those in opposition focused on mostly what they felt were negative impacts. These were expressed both in terms of establishing a National Park, with issues over negative effects of increased tourism, bureaucracy and regulation; and also the lack of infrastructure investment, which included poor state of roads, increased housing costs and seeing little economic benefit.

The majority of those in support focused on the benefits of a National Park, including economic regeneration, positive effects of increased tourism, the positive impact on environmental protection, conservation and ecosystem health. They felt National Park status would elevate the area and increase possibilities of inward investment. Those undecided tended to focus on prioritising health, education and infrastructure.

Sample quotes

SUPPORTERS

It is an area of high landscape and nature value and should be looked after. We need a sustainable future for Galloway. [Anon, business, 11330NSDE387]

Economic development, revival of town centres and business and people suffering, increase opportunities and things to do in the area. Improve hiking trails and accessibility to the outdoors. [Anon, household, 11330NSDE128]

Keen to protect the area and its environment & biodiversity. Keen to encourage year round prosperity. [Anon, household, 11330NSDE150]

Preservation + conservation of the natural environment for now + future

generations, control of industrial development, protecting wildlife. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE122]**

An opportunity to arrest the decline of the area, create opportunities for work, development of tourism, care of the environment, flora and fauna, for ecological, biological, cultural & scenery reasons, and with regard to climate change. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE288]**

OPPONENTS

Another layer of bureaucracy, that has to be paid for. More regulations. Less local accountability over time. Unaccountable hierarchy over time. More costs in the long term to taxpayers, locals, local businesses. **[Anon, business, 11330NSDE116]**

Information put forward so far also does not explain what interventions are planned to mitigate against the impact of tourism and climate change on our landscape. Climate change will affect the condition of our local habitats and wildlife, will any future plans to tackle this adversely affect farming practices or include consultation with local farmers who currently manage our landscape (reasonably successfully)?

Will Natural Flood Management, River Restoration, Peat Restoration, Living Machines and Swales, for example, be prohibited as a way to manage climate change as they change the appearance of our towns and countryside, or will the local area be able to be innovative and lead the way in landscape management under the management of a Park Authority? **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE134]**

My main concern is conservation and protection of the natural environment, The idea of a national park is being promoted on the basis of increased tourism and economic benefit. Increased tourism is not compatible with protection of the environment and conservation. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE195]**

POSSIBLE OPTIONS FOR THE NATIONAL PARK AREA

Q2a Which option do you prefer?

Table 6 – breakdown of responses listing preferred area option

Option	Count	Percentage
Option 1	48	14.1%
Option 2	23	6.7%
Option 3	64	18.8%
Don't know/No opinion	32	9.4%
Blank	174	51.0%
Total	341	-

Q2b Would you like to make any changes to or comments on your preferred option (e.g. make it smaller or larger, add or remove particular areas, features or settlements)? If so, where and why?

Summary

The highest proportion of those in opposition preferred Option 1 if a National Park had to go ahead, although a number selected Option 3. The majority of those in support favoured Option 3, with the next highest number selecting either an expanded Option 1 or an expanded Option 2. The few undecided felt an expanded Option 1 would be preferable.

Sample quotes

GENERAL

I would like to shout out for the coasts from New Abbey to Girvan! Galloway would be the only Scottish NP with a coastline. The transition from estuary to seabird cliffs along the Solway is very special. As is the Ayrshire 'volcanic' coast. [Anon, individual, 11330NSDE213]

If you must, make it in areas where it is most challenging for farmers to actually maintain the landscape and nature through agricultural activity (e.g. Cairngorms). Believe it or not, farmers are actually respectful of the land, soils and nature. [Anon, business, 11330NSDE388]

None. I oppose any plan of any type for a national park in SW Scotland. This consultation questionnaire does not allow me that option. I believe a National Park status will destroy the social balance which is needed to maintain living, real, all-age, all-income communities. [Lydia Bonaventura, household, 11330NSDE249]

OPTION 1

Option 1 and coastal area of the Machars and Rhins. Farming is critical to business in this area and potential for negative impacts (planning restrictions etc?) could be reduced by keeping to coastal areas which are, in my opinion, outstanding! **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE330]**

Given my preference not to have a National Park, I believe option 1 covers the most significant landscape / biome etc in the region, therefore requires most protection. I would carefully consider whether larger settlements should be included. **[Name not provided, individual, 11330NSDE203]**

If the Scottish Government do take the misguided (and wildly unpopular) decision to proceed with the national park, its boundaries should be confined to an area similar to that of the existing Galloway Forest Park or core UNESCO Biosphere and avoid as many local towns and villages as possible. This would go some way to preventing the places where local people actually live and work from becoming swamped with tourists, litter and traffic (more than they already are).

Additionally, the coast section from Dalbeattie to Dumfries should be removed. This is a local gem, beauty of which largely comes from the fact that it is mostly unknown by those not from the area. The road from Kippford to Dumfries in particular is completely unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and is dangerous enough during the summer months as it is with tourists who do not know the road driving irresponsibly. If you have to put a park somewhere, please do not include this area. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE414]**

Area centred around the existing Galloway Forest? **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE245]**

Probably Option 1 plus Wigtownshire otherwise I feel the area would be too big. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE441]**

OPTION 2

Extend option 2 to include New Luce and Castle Douglas. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE134]**

OPTION 3

Option 3 offers the greatest benefits and will spread them (and any tourist presence) across the widest area. ideally it should cover the same area on the GSAB reserve, although the northern margin may not qualify. Option 1 is too small. **[Anon, business, 11330NSDE387]**

It would be really important for option 3, due to Girvan and Stranraer having massive potential. It will give highly deprived areas a huge opportunity to come back and not be left behind. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE128]**

Add in Balmaclellan, Corsock, Moniave - areas which have suffered rural decline and would benefit. **[John Carolan, household, 11330NSDE146]**

Option 1 essential but have no problem with extension to include 2 + 3. However, I do think the Eastern boundary should extend to Moniave on the A702. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE148]**

If it has to go ahead, then cover the whole area so that the population can benefit from the so called improvements and new ones building. Public transport need totally reorganising - almost nonexistent near my home, also better hospital facilities for the inevitable accidents, emergencies etc. **[Mrs. Thelma Wells, household, 1133ONSDE192]**

Make it on the Galloway boundary up to Dalmellington and across to Girvan, then nobody in Galloway misses out. **[Anon, individual, 1133ONSDE125]**

PLANNING, FUNCTIONS AND POWERS

Q3 Please note any comments on these suggestions for planning, access, forestry and wind farms in the box below.

Summary

A majority of those in support felt that a National Park should be a consultee on wind farms and forestry, as well as be the access authority. There was also a desire to improve access. They further felt that a National Park should be the strategic co-ordinator e.g. for Local Development Plans and/or wider plans, and for planning, to have a consultee role including call-in powers.

For those opposed, a majority felt that a National Park would add additional bureaucracy, and a lesser number also felt a National Park was unnecessary. Those undecided equally favoured access authority powers for a National Park, with Local Authorities to retain planning but did not refer to other options.

Sample quotes

SUPPORTERS

I favour the three planning authorities keeping their existing responsibilities and thus providing continuity. A park authority partnership appeals. The experience of other national parks in Scotland in managing access, recreation & visitors seems an obvious example to follow. We favour the harnessing of wind and water & forestry for energy supplies and see a role for the input at the park authority. **[Anon, household, 1133ONSDE133]**

Town + Country Planning: presumably, if a large enough area is identified then it will be necessary to work with all the existing planning authorities to maximise communication on the many aims of any park plan. Forestry + Wind Farm Dev: makes sense for the Park Authority to be a statutory consultee on these issues. **[Anon, household, 1133ONSDE147]**

1) Planning. Prefer a coordinated response. With farmers being represented. Wouldn't like to see farmers dealing with complex 'red tape'. 2) Access. Would like to see wild camping restricted. Ranger service would be good; protection & profile. 3) Forestry etc. Like the idea of long term planning, shared vision today to protect the environment for the future is very possible. **[Anon, household, 1133ONSDE258]**

I think it is important that the park authority has a say in wind farm development, especially to protect bird life. A ranger service is also a good idea. I think the planning and development should be a balanced partnership between park authority and existing planning authority. I would like to see the general emphasis of this park being the protection and support of wildlife,

rather than just a tourist destination, with possibly no-go areas at certain seasons. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE265]**

OPPONENTS

In the event of a national park coming into being our household would oppose the introduction of another key stakeholder in planning issues. By restricting development to be in keeping with the aims of the park and no doubt in keeping with some twee vision of what Dumfries and Galloway should look like you would be stifling innovation and limiting the evolution and improvements to the built environment potentially condemning us to living in a museum. The existing planning restrictions are sufficient and our planning department adequate. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE134]**

All planning should be done with biodiversity and consideration to the environment first and foremost. if the loop can be closed (donut economics) and it costs more, then that is how it should be done. Access to park should be stricter. Where is the money for public transport? Infrastructure to get people in and about when they're here is not there and too expensive. Localised plans for battery storage to power any new facilities. (v. expensive!) **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE191]**

It is not clear what the 'Park Plan' would involve. Local authorities already have these powers and can work together for joint interests. If the NP only covered 'Galloway', only one LA would be involved. These functions already exist. Windfarms and forestry provide long-term secure employment, which are needed in this area. "Tourism" is seasonal work, in the main, and less secure. **[Name not provided, individual, 11330NSDE203]**

Since 2003 legislation affording the public rights to access peoples land (whatever its use); those living in scenic areas can feel disenfranchised from their rights as "custodians" of these ancient lands. This leads to frustration the feeling of impotence and estrangement from overarching authorities who do not put people or homes first - but conglomerate interests. **[Palgowan Farm, individual, 11330NSDE206]**

UNDECIDED

Planning should remain mainly with the council right of responsible access should remain commerical forest and long term woodland regeneration should continue. Unfortunately selective felling of trees in commercial forestry does not work. Wind farms and the cabling to the national grid is necessary for future electricity supply security. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE441]**

BOARD COMPOSITION

Q4a Do you support these suggestions for Board size and percentage of directly elected members

Table 7 – breakdown of responses in relation to board size and composition

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	65	19.1%
No	124	36.4%
In part	55	16.1%
Blank	97	28.5%
Total	341	-

Q4b What alternative options do you suggest?

Summary

The most commonly expressed preference was that there needed to be fewer Scottish Government appointees, and more directly elected members. There were various other opinions expressed - the next highest number from those in opposition wanting all local representatives and more landowner representation. Those in support focused on a smaller board.

Sample quotes

SUPPORTERS

Board composition 12 members: 5/5/2 15 members: 6/6/3 [Invergarven Press, business, 11330NSDE413]

6 - directly elected 4 - local authority 2 - Scottish Ministers [Anon, household, 11330NSDE166]

15 board members, 8 elected from local wards to give our communities more say and equal nos to oppose, 4 each from councils + ministers. [Marie McDean, household, 11330NSDE350]

Max 2 central government appointees to work for NPA in Edinburgh + 4 LA appointees. 8 directly elected - big area geographically + roads are bad. [Anon, individual, 11330NSDE378]

OPPONENTS

In the event of a national park coming into being our household would oppose the proposed board membership. There are a number of professions of key stakeholders missing which would be key to running a sustainable modern National Park. I would suggest that you include Environmentalists, Farmers, Fishermen, a representative from Forestry and Land Scotland, Young people and Subject Matter Experts on infrastructure, climate change, safety etc. Rather than having a number of members from the local council it should be sufficient to work collaboratively with the council. You also appear

to have a disproportionate number of Scottish Ministers appointed - given the number we send to the Scottish Parliament it seems odd to have so many on the board of the National Park. I feel that the board would work better with less councillors and politicians and more Subject Matter Experts and locals. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE134]**

Less members form government. Less members from councils. More members from local people. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE211]**

Directly elected - 6 / Local nominations - 3 / Scottish Ministry - 3 **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE120]**

Representatives of indigenous industries i.e. farming, forestry, fishing, tourism, retail organisations. People must have lived here for over 10 years to qualify. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE161]**

UNDECIDED

More members elected by local residents. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE245]**

I suggest more input from directly elected members and only galloway councillors. If need be 1 councillor from the 2 ayrshire authorities. 1 or 2 max msp is enough. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE441]**

Q4c Please explain why

Summary

There were a number of elements respondents focused on. These included the importance of local voices; that those appointed to the board must know or live in the local area; that elected members should be in the majority; and there needed to be a balance of interest on the board. Other elements included appointees needing to have community benefit in their remit, along with local accountability.

Sample quotes

SUPPORTERS

Need adequate representation but not too large a board - try to involve others through advisory committees. **[Anon, business, 11330NSDE387]**

More members allow for a greater spread of opinions and the lack of availability of some at times would not hinder proceedings. I am unclear if these are volunteer positions or if they are f/t or p/t. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE133]**

The calibre of Board members is absolutely critical and must include governance and special knowledge of wildlife; farming etc more members does not mean more high calibre. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE219]**

The local representation MUST be able to outvote ministerial appointees. **[Name not provided, individual, 11330NSDE139]**

OPPONENTS

Option 1 and 2 are models of cumbersome, ineffective ways to quickly deal with issues **[Anon, business, 11330NSDE171]**

Must be people reared and established in this area, aware of local needs and history. This is a farming area not a playground area for tourists. **[Name not provided, individual, 11330NSDE126]**

National Park Board undemocratic. Most are appointed by the Scottish Government and not accountable to the local community but to the Scottish Government. Undemocratic and vulnerable to political interference / manipulation. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE149]**

This gives the locally elected councils the majority which is how it should be. The govt appointees should bring expertise in; land use (farming, economic development/tourism renewables culture **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE310]**

To give local voices in the 5 areas: natural heritage, cultural heritage, farming / forestry etc / recreation / community development **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE380]**

UNDECIDED

Galloway is part of D&G and therefore Dumfriesshire councillors should not control decisions relating to Galloway. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE441]**

More understanding of local issues by local people. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE245]**

BOARD EXPERTISE

Q5a Should Scottish Ministers appointments to the Board include expertise on nature, farming and forestry?

Table 8 – breakdown of responses to board expertise

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	156	45.8%
No	51	14.0%
Blank	134	39.3%
Total	341	-

Q5b What other areas of expertise would the Board require, and why?

Summary

The headline choices of other skills included community engagement and development, tourism and hospitality, local interest and knowledge, planning and infrastructure, transport and travel, and environment, nature, ecology and biodiversity. Those who were undecided also favoured community wellbeing alongside access and recreation.

Sample quotes

SUPPORTERS

The board will need expertise on Nature (including landscape) farming, forestry, tourism, business, planning but these can be included via the full range of appointments. Scottish Ministers should use their appointments to secure a balance of interests. "Single" interest reps should not be appointed (e.g. reps for NFUS) as board members must take a holistic approach to delivering the parks objectives. **[Anon, business, 11330NSDE387]**

There is a large creative community in Dumfries and Galloway, and this should have representation on the board. It is also interesting with such a large coastal area that fishing and marine expertise is not mentioned. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE112]**

Renewables and circular economy **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE176]**

Representation of local communities within the park area so that the public have accessible board members to whom they can direct concerns, queries or suggestions. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE160]**

Biodiversity, climate change. Diversification of business skills for small business job creation linked to food / fish / cultural / industries / green & eco systems. Marketing, networking local industry & goods product streams & outlets. Cultural industries for GDP - small & 2nd income generation linked to existing & new ways to link with future eco / diversity / climate **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE240]**

OPPONENTS

Transport infrastructure, house, employment. Scottish ministers are not experts in Farming or forestry. they are open to be lobbied by business interests. **[Anon, business, 11330NSDE171]**

Especially in farming. This is an area of superb land for producing crops and animals. Unlike other national parks, this is an area of superb land. the area is already beautiful because of the land management already happening. The Board should have the expertise of practising farmers in the area. **[Anon, business. 11330NSDE388]**

In the event of a national park coming into being each member of the board must live at least 60% of their time in the National Park. We would also like to see people engaged who have careers in industry that gives them the appropriate level of expertise with regards to managing or chairing a large public body (in the case of the chair) or working with or within a public body, providing advice on environmental, climate change or planning concerns, who have experience of the forestry, farming, utility or environmental sectors, who are willing to work collaboratively with the local authorities and local stakeholders and who will take a systems thinking approach to the management of the park area. They also need to consider the impact of Park authority decisions on neighbouring areas so as not to create disparity for those within. **[Anon, household, 11330NSDE134]**

Biodiversity and ecology, rewilding, flora and fauna, Traffic management, environmental management and assessment, flood resilience, landscape

architecture and green infrastructure. Materials and waste management, land contamination risk, highways engineering, geotechnical engineering, sustainability and climate change [Anon, household, 11330NSDE319]

UNDECIDED

Access - to improve this for all. Health - to measure impact on local communities. Planning - to ensure sensible interpretation of planning laws. Communication - hasn't been very good up to now! [Anon, individual, 11330NSDE245]

NAME OF THE NATIONAL PARK

Q6a Do you agree the park, if established, should be called the Kingdom of Galloway National Park?

Table 9 – breakdown of responses to proposed name of the park

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	33	9.7%
No	204	59.8%
Blank	104	30.5%
Total	341	-

Q6b If not, what alternatives would you suggest?

Summary

There was overwhelming consensus for Galloway National Park, with the Kingdom of Galloway National Park provoking an overwhelming negative response. There was a small contingent favouring Southwest Scotland National Park, and the rest was made up of individual suggestions ranging from the Galloway Hills National Park, through Dark Sky National Park to Galloway and Ayrshire National Park.

Sample quotes

SUPPORT

Galloway National Park. Kingdom of Galloway National Park is too much of a mouthful and people will, in practice, reduce it to Galloway NP (like Lomond/Trossachs) so might as well start there. “kingdom of Galloway” means little to most people here. [Anon, individual, 11330NSDE342]

If option 1 and/or 2 it should be called Galloway National Park. If it includes option 3, then the Kingdom of Galloway National Park is appropriate. [Robert Bealby, individual, 11330NSDE346]

Don't know, but it's too long & too grandiose. It should be two words like Yorks Moors, Yorks Dale, Peak District, etc [Anon, individual, 11330NSDE222]

OPPOSE

The name of the park is an insignificant issue and should be low on the list of considerations. However, the South West of Scotland would seem to be a more logical and modern name to describe the proposed park area. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE414]**

Galloway National Park. Keep it simple, recognisable and forward looking. The kingdom of Galloway has no current relevance and refers back to a brief and questionable historic period - no one calls us a kingdom today. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE310]**

If established, option 1 would be suitably named the Galloway (or D+G) N.P. Girvan and Dalmellington are not in Galloway, so the option 2/3 model should have a more generic name - Galloway + Carrick or SW Scotland. Definitely not Kingdom!! **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE203]**

UNDECIDED

Kingdom of Galloway is awful! No. If this national park is to happen then Galloway national park is the only one I would accept. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE441]**

Gallow & Ayrshire NP. Southwest Scotland NP **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE245]**

Q12 Please add here any other comments that are relevant to the proposal.

Summary

Respondents used this space for a wide range of elements, with those in opposition citing negative aspects of tourism, concerns over costs of a National Park, the infrastructure, the impact on housing as well as expressing their dissatisfaction with the consultation process. Those in support chose to highlight the positive aspects of a National Park including community development, economic regeneration, tourism and employment possibilities alongside concerns around their perception of the negative impacts of land management. All highlighted their concerns over infrastructure and the need for improvements as well as the need to fund existing agencies whether as part of a new National Park or not.

Sample quotes

SUPPORTERS

A national park is an opportunity to raise the profile of the area, attract investment, provide jobs etc. Without it, southwest Scotland will continue to be neglected, our roads will deteriorate even further, our young people will keep moving away and nature will become even more depleted. A NP may not fix all our problems, but rejecting the opportunity it presents certainly won't either. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE167]**

The area of the proposed national park is in desperate need of new, long term investment. Our shops and hospitality businesses are constantly closing down in rural areas and we want to see this change. In Girvan, half the high street is empty and in disrepair. Barr has no pub left. Ballantrae has no pub left. Colmonell pub only serves drinks, Barrhill & pub closed down and

surrounding towns are incredibly rundown... we need to encourage more tourists in to bring revenue. We must also protect our beautiful landscape and enhance walking trail accessibility. We also are sick of seeing windfarms put up in the area and spoiling the landscape, so we want stricter regulations on where they can be erected. Farmers and landowners are taking over the area and doing whatever they want. **[Anon, household, 1133ONSDE128]**

The natural cultural heritage of the area and the sustainability of the region is being eroded by the destructive dairy industry fuelled by the Scottish Parliament and the covering of Sitka Spruce encouraged by huge financial incentives. This must stop!

This is why big farmers are so intimidating and driving the Nat Park lobby. No one is allowed to say yes, they are afraid. This no campaign is horrific and divisive. Sites for campervans with toilets and plug in points to channel the vans where we want them. Discourage/exclude them from sensitive areas ie Carrick, Brighthouse in a gentle sensitive way.

Art and nature based tourism to be encouraged, cycling, boating, walking, bird watching, filmmaking, festivals, creative arts, music. Keep young people. more deciduous trees! Shops, hotels and restaurants are closing each day, nearly all our hotels are for sale, we need to encourage and promote entrepreneurship, up our game in the hospitality sector.

We need more Festivals, events, happenings, cycling events, water based events (not motorised) Nature based tourism. First thing is to improve all out road surfaces and transportation issues. **[Anon, individual, 1133ONSDE289]**

(1) Co-ordinated data & marketing of events i.e. oyster festival, book fair, shows etc in conjunction with the park. (2) Don't rely on Facebook (3) Opportunity for residents to have a voice in activities & events going forward. Suggestions. (4) Promote the history of the area alongside nature etc. Including stories & trails. (5) Park 'prescriptions' - utilise as centre for mental health, alcohol recovery, drug recovery, wellbeing, mindfulness, exercise classes outdoor. (6) Volunteering hub to include schools etc (7) Eco initiatives **[Anon, household, 1133ONSDE258]**

Following lessons learned on the north coast 500, we liked their idea of encouraging visitors to consider their impact when visiting and whether they could do something positive for the area eg donate to foodbank or take part in a beach clean, or use public transport.

We feel strongly that there is no point moving this project forward unless there is money and capability to upgrade and maintain the already failing infrastructure. without this key element, there is likely to be conflict and animosity between visitors and locals as has happened in other areas. Responsible access should be encouraged because the wrong type of visitor or too many visitors could easily de-stabilise the fragile balance that exists. **[Anon, household, 1133ONSDE176]**

I hear comment that "we don't need low paid hospitality jobs". 1) There is a National Living Wage. 2) My former business sustained 150 families for 60 years in these awful "low paid jobs". This is just nonsense from ill-informed people. 3) What other kind of jobs do we think are coming to Galloway if we

decline National Park status? Highly paid other kinds of job will only come if we are not a NP? Really?? **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE113]**

OPPONENTS

Please do not do this! As a young person who was born in and lives and works in the area I (and many others like me) find the proposed plans incredibly distressing. The South West of Scotland has been blatantly disregarded and underfunded by both the UK and Scottish governments for decades - a fact most locals have grudgingly made their peace with. There is a chronic lack of investment across the board but especially in infrastructure, transport, education and employment opportunities.

Additionally, since the covid19 pandemic, the area has seen an influx in tourism, especially from South of the border, and this has done very little to benefit the area, instead having the effect of highlighting long term issues (such as the unsuitability of transport links + roads and increase in houses being purchased as second homes for those who do not live in the area) to residents. The introduction of a National Park here will only exacerbate these issues and will likely be the nail in the coffin prompting young and talented people to move away in search of jobs and affordable housing. Dumfries and Galloway (and the west of Scotland as a whole) needs proper, substantial investment in industry and infrastructure and more efforts made to bring businesses and jobs to the area, and this is NOT the way to do this.

A National Park will only bring a limited, seasonal income for tourism, and will stifle all other industries that actually do create long term work in the area such as farming, forestry and wind farms. Personally, I will likely also have to look outside the area in a few years when I am looking to buy a house, which I find deeply upsetting as I believe people should not be priced out of living in the area where they grew up and their family and friends reside. Additionally, my partner will likely have to look for a new job, as he currently works in the renewable energy sector which will be absolutely crushed by the introduction of a national park in the area.

Members of my immediate family and friends also work in the forestry and farming sectors, and on the whole the plan is very unpopular in the community. Please do not ignore the voices of local people once again and do not go ahead with a national park. Thank you. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE414]**

There should not be a NP simply because Scottish ministers proposed it (they propose plenty of things that don't materialise). The proposal seems to be driven by vested interests - e.g. the GSA Biosphere is keen that all the area it has included should be part of the NP. Since 2020/21, people's needs have changed - locals' opinions count. There already exist myriad organisations working to protect the region. A National Park brings another costly layer of bureaucracy - better to use the money to support work that is already underway, and to bring improvements local people need. Perhaps a small team could be established to oversee / coordinate / guide projects across the region. If it goes ahead, there should be a review / referendum in 5 years. **[Name not included, individual, 11330NSDE203]**

Most of Scotland's milk production is based in this part of Scotland, and to remain competitive in this fast changing industry, it must have the flexibility to change and adapt at speed, without having to refer to and get permission from a new National Park Authority.

The same flexibility should be available for those seeking to harvest renewable energy and the further development of forestry. Tourism is already developing at pace along the Solway & Clyde coastlines. Rural deprivation indexes are high in this area, and the creation of a National Park is likely to increase the burden on rural housing already manifest in SW Scotland. **[John Scott, individual, 11330NSDE377]**

We should use the current processes, protections and agencies to their proper extent instead of introducing a new layer. What the area needs is: 1) improved communication - roads and connectivity 2) localized healthcare (re-open local hospitals closed in covid) 3) better public transport 4) affordable housing 5) growth in agriculture, forestry and renewables 6) tourism promotion and national park does none of the above. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE310]**

Galloway needs more than farming, forestry and tourism, if we had good roads and infrastructure we could have a good mixed economy. If Galloway became a national park it would prevent other types of business from being established here, I believe NP are anti-business. **[Name not included, household, 11330NSDE359]**

UNDECIDED

After having been to 3 consultation meetings on the proposed national park, I find the lack of information, which can be seen to be reliable, totally confusing.

We have no idea of what funds may be available, no ideas on how to protect local people being priced out of the region by increasing house prices and rents, increase in holiday homes and tourism with the inherent litter, waste and general environmental damage. I would like to think there may also be positive sides but as yet I struggle to see them. **[Anon, individual, 11330NSDE441]**

NatureScot
Great Glen House
Leachkin Road
Inverness, IV3 8NW

www.nature.scot

Published: May 2025



NatureScot
NàdarAlba

Scotland's Nature Agency
Buidheann Nàdair na h-Alba